Addenda, and/or Corrigenda/Errata, and/or Supplements

Second Addenda December 13, 2012

for the

Prospectus for Campground and Related Granger-Thye Concessions Coconino National Forest Flagstaff Ranger District

issued in October 2012

The following are addenda, and/or corrections, and/or supplements to the original prospectus document issued in October 2012. For any further clarifications on these additions, please contact Rudy Bowen at 928-527-8222 or rrbowen@fs.fed.us

Item #1: Addendum and/or Corrigendum/Erratum

The Prospectus submittal deadline has been <u>extended</u> to Friday, January 4, 2013, at 4:30 PM, close of business, Mountain Standard Time. The deadline extension is to accommodate the needed time to address the additional/corrected evaluation criteria listed below, the sample operating plan, the business plan, and other items listed in this addenda.

Item #2: Corrigendum/Erratum

In regards to the Prospectus, Section I.A., Page 1, Table I.A., the revenue shown is the adjusted gross revenue and <u>NOT</u> the gross revenues. These revenues are also shown in the Prospectus, Section IV.C.5, Page 48. The gross revenues and the adjusted gross revenues are shown below.

				Average 2009-2011
	2009	2010	2011	
Gross Revenues	\$402,878.03	\$389,975.36	\$361,336.89	\$384,730.09
Adjusted Gross Revenues	\$381,676.54	\$369,816.06	\$341,030.84	\$364,174.48

Item #3: Corrigendum/Erratum and/or Supplement

Appendix 9, Sample Annual Operating Plan, has been revised from a generic template to a more detailed template. This revised sample operating plan provides clearer direction to the applicant on what to include in the operating plan. The revised Appendix 9, Sample Annual Operating Plan, will be listed on the Coconino National Forest website and on the FedBizOps website.

Item #4: Corrigendum/Erratum and/or Supplement

Appendix 16, Sample Business Plan, has been revised from a generic template to a more detailed template. This revised sample business plan provides clearer direction to the applicant on what to include in the business plan. The revised Appendix 16, Sample Business Plan, will be listed on the Coconino National Forest website and on the FedBizOps website.

Item #5: Addendum, and/or Corrigendum/Erratum, and/or Supplement

In regards to the Prospectus, Section IV.D., Page 50, under subsection "D. <u>Evaluation of Applications</u>", this section will further clarify the evaluation criteria. This addendum replaces the entire Section IV.D., "Evaluation of Applications", listed on Page 50 of the Prospectus.

A Forest Service evaluation panel will evaluate each application utilizing the non-fixed weight method.

The following evaluation criteria are listed in descending order of importance:

- 1. Proposed annual operating plan (including required and optional services).
- 2. Business plan, business experience, and references.
- 3. Financial resources.
- 4. Fees charged to the public.
- 5. Fee to the Government.

Evaluation Criteria #1 is the most important of all the evaluation criteria. Especially important is how the applicant responds to "Customer Service" (revised Appendix 9, Section 3), "Other Required Services" (revised Appendix 9, Section 15), and "Other Optional Services" (revised Appendix 9, Section 16). The remaining criteria (2-5) are listed in descending order of importance.

The following are the qualitative factors for each criterion:

BLUE (Exceeds) – The proposal is very comprehensive, in-depth, clear and uniformly outstanding in quality. Consistently high quality performance can be expected. The proposal, as written, exceeds requirements and demonstrates an exceptional understanding of goals and objectives of the acquisition. One or more major strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist.

GREEN (Acceptable) – The proposal meets all minimum requirements and generally is of high quality. Proposal demonstrates an acceptable understanding of goals and objectives of the acquisition. There may be both strengths and weaknesses, but the strengths outweigh the weaknesses. Deficiencies are minor and easily corrected. Proposal is acceptable as written. Satisfactory performance can be expected.

YELLOW (Marginal) – The proposal fails to meet minimum requirements. Proposal demonstrates a fair understanding of the goals and objectives of the acquisition. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths that exist. Weaknesses will be difficult to correct and would require negotiations.

RED (Unacceptable) – The proposal fails to meet minimum requirements. Proposal fails to meet an understanding of the goals and objectives of the acquisition. The proposal has one or more significant weaknesses that will be very difficult or impossible to correct. Major proposal revision(s) are required for minimum acceptability.